

# **Cedar River Anadromous Fish Committee**

## **SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES**

**February 21, 2002**

**Meeting Time 9:00 AM- 1:00 PM**

**Meeting Location:**

**Metering Building, Second Floor Conference Room**

**SPU Operations Control Center**

**2700 Airport Way South**

**Seattle, WA**

**Members Present:** Bruce Bachen (SPU), Steve Foley (WDFW), Paul Seidel (WDFW), Eric Warner (Muckleshoot Tribe), Sam Wright (WA Trout), Bill McKay (Puget Sound Anglers), Frank Urabeck (NW Marine Trade Association), Bill Robinson (Trout Unlimited), Tom Sibley (NMFS), and Tim Romanski (USFWS)

**Other Participants:** George Schneider (SPU), Cyndy Holtz (SPU), Karl Burton (SPU), Paul Faulds (SPU), Chuck Johnson (WDFW), Brodie Antipa (WDFW), Hans Berge (KC), and Paul Hickey (TPU)

### **I. Call to order**

Bruce called the meeting to order at 9:17AM

### **II. Approval of agenda**

Members unanimously approved the revised agenda.

### **III. Minutes review and approval for January 17, 2002 meeting**

Members unanimously approved the minutes from our last meeting following two changes requested by Frank.

### **IV. Cedar River sockeye hatchery program**

#### **Discussion of draft hatchery program documents**

Bruce opened this agenda item by acknowledging the tremendous effort put forth by Cedar River Hatchery Design Team in producing the draft hatchery program documents. He encouraged members to actively participate in a discussion and review of the documents, reminding them that in 2003 the Parties to the LMA will need to make a decision on the hatchery program. He noted that recommendations from the AFC plays an important role in guiding the Parties with their decision making process. Bruce then asked John McGlenn the TT/KCM Project Manager to proceed with his presentation of the draft program documents. John presented the members the design drawings of the hatchery building layout and then went through the draft program documents. The draft program documents were assembled into four major components: biological criteria, operating protocols, capacity analysis, and the adaptive management plan.

Following the presentation Bruce asked individual members for any feedback or comments regarding the draft program documents. Frank said the documents were put together well and he approved of the program, although he is concerned with broodstock collection. Sam provided his comments in writing, saying they were too complex to be presented verbally. Tom had no comment. Hans said his concerns were already voiced

by members. Bill M. had no comment. Bill R. was pleased with the way the program was headed and approved of the work done so far. Steve approved of the documents although he had some concern with possible beach spawning populations and fish straying. Eric said the tribes are in an interesting position. If the hatchery works that would be great but if it doesn't .... Tim had no comments. Paul S. said we are off to a great start and we have to be able to respond to information, as it becomes available. We need to look at long term funding for the different entities that have to work together on this project. Bruce agreed with Paul S., adding that we need to look for opportunities for future partnerships. Paul S. noted that there is a lot more opportunities for partnership on the Cedar River than in other areas of the State of Washington.

#### **A. EIS developments**

Bruce mentioned that we are well into the EIS process and that the program documents will be useful for assessing effects on fish populations.

#### **V. Results of 2001 sockeye studies in Lake Washington by Dave Beauchamp**

Dave Beauchamp presented AFC members with 2001 study results of Early Feeding Demand and Food Supply of Sockeye Salmon Fry in Lake Washington. This work was integrated with that of Dan Schindler and Kurt Fresh. The study was designed to address three important questions. What are the primary prey of sockeye fry during winter-early spring? Does the distribution of prey vary significantly among locations and times? Do distributions of sockeye fry and their prey create a temporal-spatial mismatch between food supply and consumer demand? To answer these questions Dave described the studies objectives: describe nearshore-offshore distribution of sockeye fry during winter-spring, determine the diet composition and size structure of fry among habitats during winter-spring, measure temporal zooplankton density among selected sites; and model spatially-explicit fry consumption demand versus food supply. Initial results showed that cyclopoid copepods are heavily exploited by sockeye during the early growth period and provide an important prey alternative to *Daphnia*. Size structure and apparent growth of sockeye fry is similar among nearshore and off shore habitats until March and possibly into April. The prey supply appears to be sufficient to support increased numbers of fry entering the southern end of the lake. Growth during March appears to be very slow. Ongoing analysis will compare spatial variability in fry density among beach seine and offshore sites, site-specific zooplankton density to relative fry density, and cohort-specific growth. Future critical information needs are the seasonal distribution and dispersal of fry, performance of hatchery and wild sockeye through the first growing season, and abundance estimates for key predators needed to quantify predation loss.

#### **VI. Interim mitigation for coho, chinook and steelhead Co-managers steelhead supplementation proposal**

Bruce reviewed the action taken on the steelhead proposal since the last meeting. The proposal was divided into phases; with the first being the capture of broodstock. Approval by the Parties has been obtained to spend the money needed to capture broodstock at the locks, while allowing time to determine what, if any, supplementation activity should be undertaken. Bruce asked members to contribute ideas on what should be done with steelhead to help identify a plan that the committee could support for funding. He asked the co-managers to bring the members up-to-date on the steelhead supplementation proposal.

Steve noted the difficulty in producing a proposal under emergency supplementation that addresses requirements in the HCP: (1) such intervention is needed for the purpose of

population support, (2) supplementation can be conducted without significant risks to the population be supplemented, (3) risks of supplementation can be effectively monitored and managed adaptively to protect the long-term genetic integrity and demographic viability of the target population; and (4) the risks of supplementation of the target population will not result in significant risks to non-target salmonid populations.

Steve said he talked with WDFW genetics staff and they could only monitor the after affect of supplementation on genetics. Bruce asked Steve to talk about the strategy for steelhead supplementation. Steve pointed out that from a strategy perspective the proposal on the table at the last meeting to raise smolts would work. Trapped fish could be raised as smolts and released. However, when you start assessing the risks of supplementation you run into challenges.

Frank told the co-managers that we need to have a proposal put together by the next meeting that procedurally address the four elements in emergency supplementation. The co-managers agreed to have a proposal done by March 14, 2002. Bruce said we need to focus on identifying a sound strategy for steelhead supplementation and then make sure that the process supports its implementation. He noted that the whole interim program (process) needs to be reviewed and would be on the next agenda.

## **VII. Public comment (scheduled for 11:30)**

There were no public comments.

## **VIII. Information and discussion items**

### **Landsburg fish passage update**

Members confirmed that they received this information and it was self-explanatory.

### **Draft Evaluation of the Cedar River Sockeye Salmon Hatchery: Analysis of Adult Otolith Recoveries**

Bruce confirmed March 14, 2002 as the date for Kurt Fresh to present the AFC with the results of his otolith report. The presentation will take place at the Metering Conference Room from 10:00 AM until 12:00 PM. Most of the members indicated they would be attending the meeting.

### **Integrating Salmon Habitat Restoration and Flood Hazard Initiatives: Societal/Biophysical Estimators for the Cedar River and Implications for Regional Rivers** Collaborators: T.M. Leschine, D.L. Fluharty (UW Marine Affairs)

This item was omitted due to time constraints.

### **Broodstock Collection Report 2001**

Bruce raised the need to complete a report on broodstock collection efforts in 2001. Paul mentioned that Hal Michaels is willing to compile the information needed for the report once he has received information from Brodie and from Karl Burton. Bruce said that Karl would have the redd survey report finished in April and asked that the rest of the information be available by then so Hal could complete the report.

## **IX. Plan next agenda for meeting scheduled for March 21, 2002**

Bruce reminded members that SPU Director Chuck Clark will be attending the March AFC meeting.

Frank referred to the written comments on the hatchery program provided by Sam and said that he wanted to see a discussion of the comments at a future meeting.

**A. Broodstock Collection**

This item was omitted due to time constraints and was moved to next month's agenda.

**X. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.